UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,303	09/11/2003	Nobumasa Suzuki	P24195	3578
	7590 12/21/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.	<del>-</del>	EXAMINER	
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE	<b>.</b>	O CONNOR, CARY E	
RESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3732	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE .	
2 MO	NTUC	12/21/2006	FIECT	DONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 12/21/2006.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

		•	
٠,			
N١	ı		

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/659,303	SUZUKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cary E. O'Connor	3732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions after to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state the mail of the period by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire  or will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  the cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	Sentember 2006					
_						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		secution as to the morite is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quavle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	SACCOUNT AS TO THE MEMIS IS				
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awn from consideration.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	lan atantina a d					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul><li>12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig</li><li>a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:</li></ul>	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		nn No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		4				
	The second copies not receive	<b>u</b> .				
Attachment(s)						
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	PTO-413)				
) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojima et al (5,147,361) in view of Scharf (6,682,563). Ojima shows, in Figure 4, a vertebra body plate 40 comprising a main body portion a plurality of screw insertion holes 44, 45 that are the only holes in the body portion. The screw holes are the same shape and size and spikes 13 extend from the body portion. Ojima does not disclose that the body portion has a rhombic shape and that the screw holes are provided on at least one of the diagonal lines that connect opposite corners of the body portion. Scharf shows a rhombic vertebra body plate 10 comprising a plurality of screw holes 31, 32 located on the diagonal lines connecting opposite corners of the body portion. Scharf states that the rhombic shape is desirable so that "multiple devices can be utilized on a single spinal column...disposed in relatively close proximity without having the plates members interfere and without reducing the efficacy of the mounting mechanism." (column 2, lines 41-45). It would have been obvious to form the body plate of Ojima in the shape of a rhombus and locate the holes on the diagonal lines, as taught by Scharf, so that a plurality of plates may be used in close proximity without reducing efficacy of the system. As to claims 2 and 3, Ojima, as modified by Scharf, discloses the claimed

invention except for the spikes having a V-shaped cross section. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the spike with a V-shaped cross section, since applicant has not disclosed that such solve any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configurations a person ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of providing a bone gripping means. In re Dailey and Eilers, 149 USPQ 47 (1966). As to claim 5, given the similarity in the shapes of Scharf's plate and applicant's plate, it is held that the plate of Ojima as modified by Scharf is formed to have a curved shaped corresponding to a peripheral surface of a vertebral body.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharf (6,682,563) in view of Errico et al (6,780,186). Scharf shows a rhombic vertebra body plate 10 comprising a plurality of screw holes 31, 32 located on the diagonal lines connecting opposite corners of the body portion. The plate also includes spikes 25. Scharf discloses that the holes 31 and 32 have different shapes and sizes. Errico shows a bone plate having screw holes 110 located on diagonal lines connection opposite corners. These holes are of same shape (elongated) and size (see Figure 1a, column 6, lines 30-33) so that "coupling elements 132 are free to move independently and selectively moved by the surgeon... into the ideal position". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form all the holes of Scharf as taught by Errico, so that the coupling elements may be positioned in the ideal position during surgery. As to claims 2 and 3, Scharf discloses the claimed invention except for the spikes having a V-shaped cross section. It would have been an

obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the spike with a V-shaped cross section, since applicant has not disclosed that such solve any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configurations a person ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of providing a bone gripping means. In re Dailey and Eilers, 149 USPQ 47 (1966). As to claim 5, given the similarity in the shapes of Scharf's plate and applicant's plate, it is held that the plate of Scharf is formed to have a curved shaped corresponding to a peripheral surface of a vertebral body.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cary E. O'Connor whose telephone number is 571-272-4715. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on 571-2724964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cary E. O'Connor Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

ceo